

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,244	01/16/2004	Shoichi Ishida	11-216	5325
23400 75	590 04/04/2006		EXAMINER	
POSZ LAW GROUP, PLC			BEAULIEU, YONEL	
12040 SOUTH SUITE 101	LAKES DRIVE		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
RESTON, VA	20191		3661	
			DATE MAILED: 04/04/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/758,244	ISHIDA, SHOICHI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Yonel Beaulieu	3661	_		
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ad	ldress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rd will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI ute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this or BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16	January 2004				
	nis action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		ters, prosecution as to the	e merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under	·	•			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application	on.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
·· _					
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2004 is/an 		phicotod to by the Examin	or		
	, ,	· ·	ei.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre			ED 4 121(d)		
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	,	• •	` , ,		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. {	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	_				
application from the International Bure	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	st of the certified copies not	received.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date			
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		nformal Patent Application (PTC	D-152)		

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art.

Although what is claimed is not identical with the teaching of the prior art (based upon fig. 7 as supported by pages 1 through 3 at line 27 of Specification), they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention the prior art teaches an equivalent apparatus/control unit (fig. 7) that achieves the same end result of implementing a count through a timer in response to a direct power supply from a battery.

Claims 1 – 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. (US 4,887,024) in view of Munch (US 6,087,598).

Regarding claims 1 - 26, Sugiyama et al. teaches all of the limitations including an electronic control unit/apparatus for a vehicle (not explicitly shown) which is made to detect a load (person) on a vehicle seat (16) and to carry out a count through the use of a timer (2) in response to a direct power supply from a battery (block 11; fig. 2A; col. 4,

lines 58 – 64 and col. 6, lines 14 - 18) and to fall into a stand-by state and which is placed into an activation (reset) when a count value reaches a preset timer activation time or when an ignition key is turned on (col. 4, lines 58 – 64), said control unit comprising: first and second oscillation means (within item 3) for supplying a main clock signal and a sub-clock signal to carry out the timer count (col. 3, lines 24 – 39; col. 4, lines 22 – 38), but fails to teach the calibration aspect.

However, Munch teaches, in the same field of endeavor of an apparatus carrying out detection of a load on a vehicle seat and to carry out a count through the use of a timer, calibrating a timer (Munch adjusts different features including inflation timing as noted in col. 2, lines 25 – 38 at least).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Sugiyama et al.'s teaching by calibrating (the adjustment is construed as calibration) the timer as evidenced by Munch in order to enhance safety.

Overall, the combination of Sugiyama et al. and Munch is at least fully functionally equivalent to the claimed invention because the same end result of making a decision to carry out a timer count is achieved.

Conclusion

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yonel Beaulieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-6955. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W 9-3; F 9-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas BLACK can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3661